

PLANNING AHEAD

Notes for the Planning and Policy
Community



US Army Corps
of Engineers

August 2005

Volume 8, Issue 8

Meet the New Deputy Director of Civil Works

Mr. Steve Stockton is the new Deputy Director of Civil Works, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C. He was formerly assigned to South Pacific Division under a number of positions where he was responsible for the executive direction and oversight of civil works and military programs and business management operations. Upon his arrival, the Planning Ahead Team met with him to gain knowledge on his thoughts and views of where the Corps is headed, and what that means with respect to Planning. We were also interested in what he thinks the planning community should be doing to prepare for future challenges, and his plans to lead them in doing so.

Mr. Stockton's perspective on planning is that it is exciting because planners are at "the interface between the science and the rational versus the political" He speaks highly of initiatives such as the Planning Associates Program, the Planning Centers of Expertise, the Planning Community of Practice (CoP), and the new Engineering Circulars (ECs) that have been put in place to help steer us in the right direction and change the mindset of how we formulate projects. He mentions the importance of EC 1105-2-409, Planning in a Collaborative Environment, in supporting collaborative decision making. He says that it is a huge step toward rethinking how we apply processes and come up with more sophisticated ways of evaluating projects and outputs.

He links the Collaborative Planning EC to the Corps Strategic Plan, which lays the foundation for broader approaches. Our next step is to operationalize it. Adopting these concepts as we start taking a more expansive view of what Principles and Guidelines allows us to do, and taking a broader perspective beyond the Corps' relatively narrowly defined federal interest, he believes, will allow us to come up with plans to address much broader problems than the ones the Corps alone has authorities to fix. As a collaborative partner, the Corps should try to understand the needs within basins and watersheds by coming to the table not only with our tools, authorities and expertise, but by being open to the resources that others (local sponsors and stakeholders, academia, etc) may have to contribute to finding solutions. Then, one should think about how all of these tools and methods can come together to create more comprehensive solutions. Again, he says the key to doing so is building relationships with the community.

Two examples came to mind which he feels significantly convey these concepts. Central City (Ft. Worth, Texas) is one because it displays a large set of problems and brings people of different areas together trying to achieve a comprehensive solution. The second is Napa (California), which was authorized in the 1960's as a concrete line trapezoidal channel. It was rejected by local sponsors but through collaborative efforts, the team recognized not only flood control problems they wanted to solve, but also ecosystem restoration components that could provide flood protection as well as a way for economic growth.

He also challenges us to ask: How can this broader perspective apply to existing projects as well as new ones? "Because society's needs change over time, we have an obligation to periodically go back and reevaluate what we've done to address contemporary needs, values, and developmental growth patterns." Once again, Mr. Stockton encourages building a relationship with the community to better answer these questions.

Featured Articles

New ECs and Related Material are
Posted on Web!.....2

Ability to Pay Survey.....2

Monthly Columns

Cultural Resources.....5

Nonstructural News.....6

Planning Centers
of Expertise.....7

Planning Associates Update.....7

Planning Webs Ahead.....9

1-900-Planner.....10

Planning CoP Calendar.....10

Announcements.....10

Want to Contribute?

Want to Subscribe?

See Page 12!

Internal relationships and interoperability among our CoPs, Centers of Expertise, and other groups are just as important as maintaining external relationships, he adds. He recalls the SPD Planning CoP as being a great model for other CoPs in demonstrating how to share information, grow capability within the Corps, and becoming more relationship-driven in our methods, hence his phrase "95% relationships, 5% technology." He suggests we also take a look at ourselves and how we fit into problem-solving. Yes, there are water resources problems, and hardly ever enough resources to satisfy all needs but he feels the bottom line is to focus on how to leverage federal dollars we do receive with other resources to solve problems along with supportive guidance.

With the onset of performance based budgeting, another important focus is to design better tools to support our investment decision processes. Mr. Stockton feels that the current measures may, at times, seem crude and based highly on economic output. In competing for federal dollars, the Corps must be able to make compelling arguments to receive their place in budget priorities.

In another important realm, Mr. Stockton stands firm on ensuring that we have credible, defensible processes throughout the Corps and that those processes are not misused to achieve particular outcomes. "We need to get back to credible analyses to produce recommendations and should not compromise our analyses to support a certain set of outcomes. Without credibility, there is no use for us."

Mr. Stockton is sincere in proclaiming his enjoyment in working for the Corps for the past 30 years, having had opportunities to work with such talented people and being involved in the challenge of solving problems. He ended our discussion by stating that one of his objectives is to "stamp out cynicism -- not to ignore reality, but to have a realistic appraisal of where we are, a vision of where we want to go, and realistic strategies to move toward that vision."

Monica Franklin, Editor
Institute for Water Resources
Monica.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil

FEATURED ARTICLES

New ECs and Related Materials Are Posted on Web!

Gary Hardesty, Headquarters

The five new Engineer Circulars (ECs) (i.e. EC 1105-2-405 through -409), along with frequently asked questions and answers, MSC rollout documents, example peer review plans, and other reference materials, are now posted on the Planner's Resource Web, i.e. <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/plannersweb/index.htm>. This site will be periodically updated with the latest information on collaborative planning, peer review, planning model certification, District Commander presentations, and final report submission requirements, and planners are strongly encouraged to frequent this web site. For more information on these new ECs, please contact Mr. Bruce Carlson, CECW-PC, at (202) 761-4703, or Mr. Gary Hardesty, CECW-CP, at (202) 761-4121.

Ability to Pay Survey

Shana Heisey, Institute for Water Resources

In response to 1996 and 2000 legislation, Headquarters (HQ) has developed draft proposed guidance to revise and expand the Ability-to-Pay procedures. If approved, the new procedures will apply to a broader array of project types, as well as to feasibility studies and the Continuing Authority Program. The existing guidance limits ability to pay reductions to flood damage reduction projects only.

At the request of OMB, and to analyze the impacts of the proposed guidance, HQ distributed a survey in June 2005 via e-mail to Division MSCs to be forwarded to their corresponding district offices. Part I of the survey requests information on studies or projects located in a defined list of counties or Census areas with the nation's lowest per capita personal income. Data on the location, type, and cost-sharing breakdown are requested for projects and studies with a signed FCSA, PCA, or detailed design agreement between FY03 and FY05. Part II seeks information on all projects that have qualified for an ability to pay reduction under the existing guidance since 1 November 1989.

The table on pages 3 and 4, indicates the number of qualifying studies or projects submitted by each district. If you were not aware of this survey or if you think you have an applicable project or study not included in the list, then submit a sur-

vey as soon as possible. The proposed guidance provides specific instructions for evaluating projects and studies located in and sponsored by tribal governments, so these should be included also. It is important that we provide an accurate data assessment to OMB for their use in determining if their procedures can be approved. If you have any questions, need another copy of the survey or list of counties, please contact Shana Heisey at shana.a.heisey@usace.army.mil or 703-428-9088. Refer to the [Announcents](#) section for more contacts.

Has your district submitted a survey?		
Projects & Studies Qualifying Under Existing or Proposed Guidance		
District/ Division	Qualifying Guidance	Project Name
LRE	PROPOSED	Sea Lamprey Trap, St Mary's River
LRH	PROPOSED	Pike Co. N/S Project (Including Tribes)
LRH	PROPOSED	Martin County N/S Project
LRH	PROPOSED	Tow n of Martin, Kentucky N/S Project
LRH	PROPOSED	Wayne County Nonstructural
LRH	PROPOSED	Low er Mingo County Nonstructural
LRH	PROPOSED	Upper Mingo County Nonstructural
LRH	PROPOSED	Buchanan County Nonstructural Flood Damage Reduction Project
LRH	PROPOSED	Little Kanaw ha River
LRH	PROPOSED	Section 14 - ODOT Minersville
LRH	PROPOSED	Section 14 - Paden City
LRH	EXISTING	McDow ell County Section 202
LRH	EXISTING	Pike County N/S Project
LRH	EXISTING	Martin County N/S Project
LRH	EXISTING	Tow n of Martin, Kentucky N/S Project
LRH	EXISTING	Wayne County Nonstrcutural
LRH	EXISTING	Low er Mingo County Nonstructural
LRH	EXISTING	Upper Mingo County Nonstructural
LRH	EXISTING	Buchanan County Nonstructural Flood Damage Reduction
LRL	PROPOSED	Rough River , Sew age Treatment Plant, Hartford, Kentucky
LRL	EXISTING	North Fork Kentucky River
LRL	EXISTING	Licking River Watershed, Kentucky FWEEP
LRL	EXISTING	Rolling Fork, Lebanon Junction, Kentucky
LRL	EXISTING	Handy Riparian Habitat Restoration
MV/K	PROPOSED	McKinney Bayou, Tunica County, MS Feasibility Study
MV/K	PROPOSED	Coldw ater River Basin Below Arkabutla Lake, MS
MV/K	PROPOSED	Dillon's Bridge, Bogue Chitto River
MV/K	EXISTING	Tw o Bayou, Camden, AR
MV/M	EXISTING	Helena and Vicinity, Arkansas
MV/N	PROPOSED	Amite River and Tributaries, Ecosystem Restoration
MV/N	PROPOSED	Amite River and Tributaries, Bayou Manchac
MV/N	PROPOSED	CWPPRA-South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22)
MV/N	PROPOSED	CWPPRA, Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Cycle 2
MV/N	PROPOSED	GMWW Plaquemine Lock
MV/S	PROPOSED	Rend City Wetlands
NAB	EXISTING	Moorefield, WV
NAN	PROPOSED	Bronx River Basin Study
NWD	EXISTING	Perry Creek, IA
SAC	PROPOSED	Pocotaligo River and Sw amp Ecosystem Restoration Project
SAC	PROPOSED	Lakes Marion Regional Water System
SAJ	PROPOSED	Withlacoochee River, FL

Table 1: Ability to Pay Surveys Submitted (by district)

Projects & Studies Qualifying Under Existing or Proposed Guidance (cont.)		
District/ Division	Qualifying Guidance	Project Name
SAM	PROPOSED	Marvel Slab Low -Head Dam Removal, AL
SAM	PROPOSED	Brew ton/East Brew ton, AL
SAM	PROPOSED	Mattubbee Creek, Monroe County, MS
SPA	PROPOSED	Oak Creek, Florence, Colorado
SPA	PROPOSED	Hatch, NM
SPA	PROPOSED	Little Puerco River, Gallup, NM
SPA	PROPOSED	Sparks Arroyo, El Paso, TX
SPK	PROPOSED	Tehama, California
SPK	PROPOSED	Tule River, CA
SWG	PROPOSED	Roma Creek, Rio Grande Basin, Texas
SWG	PROPOSED	Raymondville Drain, TX
SWG	PROPOSED	South Main Channel, TX
SWG	EXISTING	Resacas at Brownville, TX

Table 1 (cont.): Ability to Pay Surveys Submitted (by district)

In Memory of....



Robert "Stoney" Burke

Robert "Stoney" Burke, Economics Team Leader in Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division passed away on July 30, 2005.

Mr. Burke began his career with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on May 22, 1978, as an appraiser in Real Estate Division, Vicksburg District. In 1979, he was reassigned to Planning Division as an Agricultural Economist. Later that year, he was promoted to the position of Regional Economist. In 1997, Mr. Burke was promoted to Supervisory Regional Economist, and in this position he led the District's Economics Team. At the time of his death, Mr. Burke was serving as Acting Chief, Environmental and Economic Analysis Branch.

Mr. Burke was an avid outdoorsman, and he enjoyed hunting and fishing. He spent much of his spare time working on his property and family property in the Big Creek Community of Calhoun County, MS.

Mr. Burke was recognized as a leader in his career field of economic analysis and as an expert in agricultural economics. He played a key role in the economic analysis of essentially every Vicksburg District project since 1997. Although Mr. Burke's entire career was with the Vicksburg District, he worked at various times with the Mississippi Valley Division and other Corps Districts. He was well known and respected by his peers throughout the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Burke is survived by his wife, Karen, his mother Earline C. Burke, and his sister, Debbie Burke.

How Archeology Can Reveal Some Fundamental Truths About Us ***by Paul Rubenstein***

Editor's Note: In the June 2005 Issue of Planning Ahead Paul Rubenstein wrote about his assignment in Iraq. Paul recently returned home and sent us the following story. Next month we'll report on how other planners have served in Iraq.

I have returned from my mission to Iraq and it is great to be home. Some of you may have read my discussion in the June issue about the Iraq Mass Graves Team, which, having been vetted through the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad was very much a straightforward description of the team mission and function. Of course, there is much more that could be told but so much is evidentiary and subject to legal limitations.

Friends and co-workers have been extremely kind and caring in welcoming me back to work. The one question that is universally asked is "What was it like there?" There is no easy answer to that question. Unlike saying "How are you today?", which is usually just asked to be polite, "What was it like there?" is a genuine interest of friends and co-workers. When people understand, though, that my team was engaged in the examination and analysis of mass graves and their contents, there is a noticeable concern about hearing too much about what I think it was like there. The question, in my case, defies a simple response.

I kept a journal, of sorts, during my time in Iraq. I wrote home daily, documenting the day's events, what I was seeing and experiencing. My observations and descriptions cover a wide range - - from the absurd and comic to the tragic and heart-breaking. From day to day, regardless of the distractions that would occur, I tried to focus many of my observations on the work we were doing and how my years of training and experience could be applied in common sense ways to accomplishing our mission. Nothing could prepare me, or even our most experienced forensic specialists, for some of what we would see. Of all the cases, or human remains, that were examined, few tell us more about human relationships than a woman discovered next to a baby in a red blanket.

The individuals were just two of many in the common grave but each was treated as the most precious of archeological finds. Recording was painstaking, using the most up-to-date digital imaging and satellite tracking to mark their geographic location. Documentation of the remains was precise and sufficient to pass every legal test in this or any other country. Finally, when the time came, the woman and child were each lifted intact and placed in a secured body bag for the helicopter transport to the laboratory.

At the laboratory, the human remains were separated from their clothes and other personal belongings. Each set of "evidence" would be inspected and analyzed by different groups of specialists. The baby, was left in the red blanket - - both being so very small and fragile. The forensic anthropologists went about their analysis in their usual way, first laying out the woman's bones on a steel table in anatomical order. Always referred to respectfully as an "adult female" and while idle talk was kept to a minimum, everyone knew she was a mother who was found next to her baby.

The "adult female" skeleton was intact, except for one set of hand bones. Her wrist bones were intact, no sign of damage or trauma to them. The hand had not been removed in some grim or obviously violent event. But it was not present. Lacking an acceptable explanation, the anthropologists moved on to the next case, the baby in the red blanket. Great care would be used in the treatment and examination of the infant; the blanket would be slowly removed so as not to disturb the tiny bones within. As the blanket was pulled back from the skeleton, the riddle of the missing hand was solved. The hand was there, underneath the blanket, covering the small ribcage and abdominal bones of the infant. So tight was the mother's clutch at the moment of their deaths, that in the grave the elder's hand bones became fused to her child and despite the most careful and benign archeological techniques employed, nothing would separate mother and child's final embrace.

We used the most sophisticated archeological techniques available to expose what remained of these two people; our team being in the vanguard of an almost unimaginable science devoted to the identification and analysis of mass graves. By our actions we ultimately discovered so much more about these two than merely their biological profile and cause of death. We discovered, or more accurately re-discovered, one of the most fundamental instincts in nature: a mother's concern for her child.

Periodically we find that doing archeology and the analyses associated with it, lead to the revelation of certain truths. In this case, we found a relationship between two people and the truth is that at the moment of execution, a mother embraced her child with great ferocity. That embrace, in that instant, communicated many things from mother to child; perhaps the most important of which is "you don't deserve this and I cannot stop it." With the discovery, excavation and evidence building, the Iraq Mass Graves Team has an answered for this woman and countless others like her - - you didn't deserve this and now we've done something that will prevent it from happening again.

NONSTRUCTURAL NEWS



National Flood Proofing Conference III

This is the last reminder for this important conference if you are at all interested in flood proofing and nonstructural measures. It is a great opportunity to learn the latest in flood proofing techniques, interact with others that are using flood proofing measures, see many exhibits of products to implement flood proofing, etc. The conference runs 12-16 September 2005 and is being held in Charleston, West Virginia. The conference will address all types of flood damage reduction opportunities, new techniques, the latest in Federal and State programs, National Flood Insurance Program compliance, tools that help to decide what the best level of protection is using flood proofing measures, flood proofing opportunities relative to community flood hazard mitigation plans and Corps project flood plain management plans, etc. A great, one day field trip will highlight the conference. This field trip will be within the Huntington District and will showcase just about any type of flood proofing there is. For more information, visit the Association of State Flood Plain Managers website at www.floods.org.

New Tools Coming to Support Nonstructural Measure Implementation

The Hydrologic Engineering Center is working on Version 2.0 of HEC-FIA [Flood Impact Analysis]. This version will have nonstructural measure analysis included. It is currently being readied for distribution by the end of Calendar Year 2005. This version of HEC-FIA will include selecting damageable structures from a geospatial display that overlays a flood inundation map. FIA will be able to compute individual structure flood damages for a particular flood event. The user will be able to consider and compare the flood damage reduction capability of any of the nonstructural measures such as structure removal from the flood plain, structure elevation, dry flood proofing, berms, etc. Flood warning and flood fighting can also be considered in this version. For more information, contact Mr. Jason Needham of the Hydrologic Engineering Center. This will be an exciting new tool that will help us all realize further that nonstructural measures have a definite place in our flood damage reduction tool box.

Planning in a Collaborative Environment

We have a new EC entitled "Planning in a Collaborative Environment" - EC 1105-2-409, 31 May 2005. This EC provides revised procedures for the conduct of Corps water resources planning and the preparation of decision documents in support of specific Congressionally authorized projects or projects that are authorized under continuing authorities. Traditionally, the Corps' approach to water resources planning has relied heavily on national economic development, determination of the "Federal interest," and more site specific planning. Today's emphasis is a much broader watershed approach with strong emphasis on collaboration among other Federal, State, Tribal, and local interests and continued implementation of the Environmental Operating Principles. The new thinking is "Collaborative Planning." The focus of this EC relative to plan selection is overall consideration of a plan's beneficial and adverse effects across the four Principles and Guidelines accounts of National Economic Development, Environmental Quality, Regional Economic Development, and Other Social Effects. After considering these effects, a plan may be a candidate for selection if it has, on balance based on analyses and collaborative judgment, net beneficial effects. Conversely, after consideration of the above, a plan will be dropped from further consideration if it does not have, on balance, net beneficial effects. The "net beneficial effects" test is when no other plan or scale has higher excess of beneficial effects over the total adverse effects. A plan's individual proj-

ect purposes or other categories of effects need not be individually justified. This EC, when combined with the direction of the Environmental Operating Principles, the Strategic Goals, and the general direction of the Nation towards flood damage reduction that maximizes all opportunities and minimizes or eliminates any adverse effects, will provide additional opportunities for implementation of nonstructural measures. To place further emphasis on the consideration of nonstructural measures to achieve the objectives of this EC, the EC requires that the nonstructural plan be one of four plans that each planning report will identify, at a minimum, that are judged to have net beneficial effects.

Larry Buss can be contacted by e-mail at larry.s.buss@usace.army.mil or by phone at 402-221-4417.

PLANNING CENTERS OF EXPERTISE

The web site of the Water Management and Reallocation Studies National Planning Center of Expertise in the Southwestern Division is now up and running at <http://www.swd.usace.army.mil/WMRSCX.htm>. Many thanks to Peter Shaw, the Technical Director of the Center for his effort on this fine work. With the addition of this site, all six of the National Planning Centers now have an up and running web page. All six of these sites can be easily reached by going to the Planner's Resource Web <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/plannersweb/> and click on "Plan Centers of Expertise" in the left hand column.

For additional information on the Planning Centers of Expertise or to offer to provide an article on one to the Centers for a future edition of Planning Ahead, please contact Ted Hillyer at: Theodore.M.Hillyer@usace.army.mil.

PLANNING ASSOCIATES UPDATE

Chapter 8: The Great White North

The month of August brought us to our nation's largest state, Alaska. Over the course of this year, we had been exposed to regional contrasts in terrain, ecosystems, weather, and culture, but never has everything been as BIG as we experienced during our twelve days in the Alaska District of the Pacific Ocean Division.

Standing in the mountains overlooking Anchorage, the city looks like a small speck in the landscape surrounded by mountains, water, dense forests and alpine tundra. It reminds one that humans may not be the dominant figure in the landscape. It also makes one wonder what role the Corps of Engineers has in such a beautiful place. Blueberries cover the ground; moose walk down the biking trails, and Dall sheep graze in the distance. And yet, when informed that the western third of Alaska has no road access, it really brought the magnitude of the countryside into focus. More importantly, it highlights the role of the Corps small boat harbors program.

In Western Alaska, the boat harbors are not merely toys for the wealthy, as may be the perception of harbors in the 'lower-48'. In Alaska, the small boats are a key component in the transportation system. And yet a boat without a harbor is practically useless. The key element is the small boat harbor, and that's where the Corps comes in. The harbor becomes the focus of the community, the link to the outside world, and the means to help survive the winter. Commercial fishing is often the only industry, and fleets from as far away as Oregon to use the fisheries and harbors. Subsistence hunting and fishing are alive and well in many native villages and the harbors provide the access to the hunting and fishing grounds.



PA Class at the start of a hike up Crow's Pass and Raven Glacier



PAs crossing an ice field on the Crow Pass Hike



PAs at the finish line Arch for the Iditarod in Nome, Alaska



Eroding Breakwater in the Village of Teller, Alaska

Despite her beauty, Alaska is also undergoing changes. One observed change is the increased melting of the seasonal ice sheets. For many communities, the ice would protect a village from the worst of the winter storms. But the advanced melting has increased sedimentation, erosion, and even changed the ecology. There is no historical precedent for some of these landscape scale changes. Some villages had noted more than 70 feet of erosion in a single year. The Corps of Engineers was asked to investigate the options.

One thinks of the scale of Alaska and tries to find the words to effectively communicate the beauty and grandeur, and the isolation and the cultural harmony with wildlife. Alaskans actually live their EOPs daily. We were lucky to get the opportunity to see this up-close and personal for a few days in Anchorage, Nome, and Teller ... and on side trips crossing a snowfield near the Raven Glacier, hiking Flat Top Mountain, and deep sea-fishing out of Seward, a small boat harbor Corps project.

Unfortunately, the policy, budgeting, and lawmaking debates take place are thousands of miles away. Those decisions are made by folks who live a dramatically different lifestyle. We must remember, as Corps planners, that the planning we do now, can impact this lifestyle for generations.

The waves, tides, and ice in Alaska make the seaways treacherous and keep many communities remote. Having safe refuge and a homeport allows this way of life to continue.

During the week, we also traveled to Nome, the final stop of the Iditarod Dog Sled race where in 1925, mushers saved hundreds of children exposed to diphtheria by carrying serum 1,100 miles to this isolated community. But not a whole lot has changed in this tiny community over the past century. It is still isolated... and that isolation is a huge consideration in our planning efforts, as mob/demob activities and short seasonal construction windows become more significant. Nowadays though, instead of mushers and huskies, transportation needs are met by small boats (drafts of less than 14-ft) and snowmobiles.

We also took a three-hour journey on a rough road north of Nome, to Teller, an even smaller community of less than 300 who are in need of many things that the Corps might be able to help with, including water treatment, supply, erosion protection, and maybe even a small boat harbor. Their economy is largely supported by subsistence living, i.e., self-reliance and sharing of harvest, be it reindeer meat or blueberries. We saw a strong cultural link to the wildlife and the land. Their problems are amplified by the harsh winters and by the scarcity of electricity, sewage treatment, and water supply... and by the slow-moving bureaucracy of the tribal councils, tribal corporations, the non-profits, the commissions, state and federal agencies.

Alaska has over 220 federally recognized native groups, and the Corps interacts with these groups as sovereign nations. We were taught the cultural do's and don'ts of dealing with tribal partners by POA's tribal liaison, Ernest Young, a native Alaskan originally from Ketchikan. Coordination and collaboration are difficult but necessary if we are going to solve some of these growing problems. Local needs have to be judiciously balanced with national intent. We heard one example of poor planning in grants provided for installing plumbing but no local infrastructure available to supply the water. Clearly, there is room for improvement at coordinating efforts.



Meeting at the Kawerak, Inc. HQ in Nome, Alaska. (Kawerak is the non-profit organization overseeing grants for the 20 Bering Strait Region Tribes.)



Seward Harbor, Alaska. A bustling port built by the Corps of Engineers. This port is the center of the community and the main draw for fishing from all over the United States.

Prior to our weeklong instruction course in small boat harbors and intergovernmental relations, each of the three sub-teams (of four members) were given a couple of days to work on our Critical Think Pieces (CTPs) which in September will be presented formally to Corps senior staff in Washington, DC. In Alaska, the three teams (named Discovery, Delta, and Yin-Yang) practiced in front of each other and received constructive comments and tips from Harry Kitch, Deputy Chief of the Planning CoP, Joy Muncy, our PA Program Manager, and Jesse Vazzano, a leadership consultant with the program. Those two days added a great deal of value to our draft presentations (and associated reports), helping to smooth out some of the kinks before our final presentations in September.

PLANNING WEBS AHEAD

Centers of Expertise

Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) information is available on IWR's Planners Resource Web. The PCX links provide POC, purpose and roles, and links to PCX web pages. The Jacksonville District Planning also has a Coastal Shore Protection PCX Technical Web Site.

Planner's Resource Web: <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/plannersweb/>
 PCX Introduction: http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/plannersweb/PCX_intro.htm
 National Ecosystem Restoration PCX: <http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/ecocx/>
 Coastal Shore Protection Technical Web Site: <http://www.saj.usace.army.mil/pd/expert3.htm>

PLANNING WEB PAGES

Corps' Districts including Honolulu, Walla Walla and Galveston have planning web pages. The pleasing Honolulu's Civil Works page has a white background blue header reflecting a simple clean design. The projects and studies link has recent project information including project descriptions, fact sheets, maps, photos and reports. Walla Walla's Planning Branch has a similar compact design with related photographs and white background. The active and current project link has a listing of projects by authority, where the General Investigation Walla Walla River Watershed link is particularly pleasing. It has a comments link providing a forum for project related public feedback. Continuing with the white background, the Galveston District's Planning and Environmental Branch's page also provides up-to-date project information. Links in the Reports Index provide planning reports--Reconnaissance, Feasibility Reports, Draft Environmental Assessments, etc, many in PDF format.

Honolulu Civil Works: <http://www.poh.usace.army.mil/civilworks.asp>
 Feasibility Study: <http://www.alawaicanalproject.net/index.htm>
 Walla Walla Planning: <http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/planning/default.htm>
 Feasibility Study: <http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/wwrbasin/default.htm>
 Galveston Planning: <http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/>
 Draft GRR Environmental Assessment: <http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe-p/Greens/>
 Draft Environmental Assessment: <http://www.swg.usace.army.mil/pe%2Dp/ICE/>
 Reports Index: <http://www.nww.usace.army.mil/planning/er/reports.htm>

1-900-PLANNER



Dear Planner:
What happens to my project in 50 years when the period of analysis is over? Does the Corps walk away from the project? Do I have to add up all the benefits and see if its still justified? Does the project evaporate?

Sincerely,
Puzzled in Phoenix

Dear "Puzzled":
The 50-year period of analysis is used to assess the project's economic justification and does not imply that the project's useful life is 50 years. The project life and the period of analysis do not have to coincide. The project life can be much greater than the period of analysis, but it cannot be less than the period of analysis.

There are two main reasons why the 50-year period of analysis is used, risk and uncertainty and the effect of discounting. As we assess benefits into future years we are adding more and more uncertainty about what the actual benefits may be. On the cost side of the equation, as the period of analysis increases, the annualized costs are reduced. However, as you approach the 50-year period of analysis the reduction in annual costs is very little.

Many Corps projects are turned over to the local sponsor when construction is complete. The local sponsor will operate and maintain the project. If the project is operated and maintained by the Corps, those expenditures may need to be justified before O&M funds are allocated. In both cases this O&M may last well beyond the period of analysis that was used to originally justify the project.

VRY,
Planner

PLANNING CoP CALENDAR

- Planning Ahead submission deadline.....third Friday of every month
- Planning Advisory Board Meeting hosted by SWD.....October 2005
- Planning CoP Conference.....9-11 May 2006

If you would like to post an item to the monthly calender, please contact Monica Franklin at Monica.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

REQUEUSTING SUBMITTAL OF ABILITY TO PAY SURVEYS

Please submit an ability to pay survey if your district/division has not already done so. For more information, refer to the [featured article](#) in this issue or contact Shana Heisey at shana.a.heisey@usace.army.mil; Jan Rasgus at Janice.E.Rasgus@usace.army.mil; or Monica Franklin at Monica.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil.

WANT TO CONTRIBUTE TO *PLANNING AHEAD*?

This newsletter is designed to improve the communication among all the planners and those we work with throughout the Corps. We hope that future editions will have mostly information and perspective from those of you on the front lines in the districts. We hope that these notes become a forum for you to share your experiences to help all of us learn from each other. We can't afford to reinvent the wheel in each office. We welcome your thoughts, questions, success stories, and bitter lessons so that we can share them on these pages. The articles should be short (2-3 paragraphs) except in some cases where you just have to say more, and should be a MS Word document. We highly encourage you to send pictures to accompany your article.

The deadline for material for the next issue is: 23 September 2005.

Planning Ahead is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Community of Practice, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 441 G Street. NW, Washington, DC 20314-1000

WANT TO SUBSCRIBE TO *PLANNING AHEAD*?

To subscribe to our distribution list, send an e-mail message to majordomo@lst.usace.army.mil with no subject line and only a single line of text in the message body. That single line of text should be: "**subscribe ls-planningahead**"

(Editor's Note: In the email address, the character following the @ sign is a lowercase "l". This is also true for the single line of text. The character immediately following "subscribe" is also a lowercase "l". If these are not typed correctly, you will receive an error message.)

To obtain a 'help' file, send only the word 'help' in the text of the message (nothing in the subject line) and address it to majordomo@usace.army.mil.

THE PLANNING AHEAD TEAM

Harry Kitch	Publisher	Headquarters
Monica Franklin	Editor	Institute for Water Resources
Larry Buss	<i>Nonstructural News</i>	Omaha District
James Conley	<i>Planning Webs Ahead</i>	South Pacific Division
Susan Durden	<i>Regional Technical Specialist</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Monica Franklin	<i>Announcements, Planning CoP Calendar</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Ted Hillyer	<i>Planning Centers of Expertise</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Joy Muncy	<i>Planning Associates Update</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Darrell Nolton	<i>Masters Program</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Ken Orth	<i>Planning Leaders' Corner</i>	Institute for Water Resources
Paul Rubenstein	<i>Cultural Resources</i>	Headquarters

To read past issues of Planning Ahead, visit:
<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwp/news/news1.htm>